

DEC 17 1929

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).
Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50.
Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918

VOL. XXIII, No. 9

MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1929

WHOLE No. 620

LIVING LATIN BOOK TWO

By

CLAIRE C. THURSBY

and

GRETCHEN D. KYNE

THE stigma, "dead and uninteresting", so often attached to Latin is swept aside by the superior, original, lively presentation of the subject by the authors of LIVING LATIN. The constant correlation between English and Latin, use of simple connected stories, rapid-fire drills, vocabularies at the end of the text, suggestions for entertainments—distinguishing features of Book One—are retained in Book Two.

While Book One arouses an interest in the Roman people by a sympathetic presentation of their life and customs, Book Two aims to create an understanding and appreciation of Roman civilization through myths, legends, and historic incidents told in Latin, and by English readings on religion, history, and literature. As in Book One, each lesson begins with a story in simple Latin which emphasizes the new grammatical principle or form to be taught and also reviews the syntax, forms, and words previously studied.

The illustrations of the new book are many and excellent. They include color plates, black and white drawings, and half-tone reproductions of Mediterranean scenes, classic art, etc.

Book Two, in accordance with the pupil's progress, proceeds more rapidly than Book One. It is intended to follow Book One and may itself be followed by Ullman and Henry's SECOND LATIN BOOK, Revised.

Book I—\$1.40

Book II—\$1.80



*This new book carries
on the tradition of
Book One for interest-
ing, well-graded con-
tent, appealing form,
simple, clear style, and
up-to-date method.*

MACMILLAN

New York

Boston

Chicago

Dallas

Atlanta

San Francisco

NOW READY



HARRINGTON AND McDUFFEE . THIRD YEAR LATIN

THIS LONG-AWAITED BOOK is now ready. Offering a greater breadth, variety, and simplicity of reading, creating more power in sight translation, and assuring the prescribed mastery of grammar, composition, and vocabulary, it is an ideal textbook to follow

GRAY AND JENKINS'S LATIN FOR TODAY. Specifically planned to meet the recommendations of the Classical Investigation, and superbly executed by distinguished authors, this two-year course has achieved a remarkable success. Thousands of Schools consider it the easiest, the soundest, and the most interesting course available.

TEACHERS will also be interested to know that there is now in preparation, to celebrate the two-thousandth anniversary of Vergil's birth next year, a new edition of the widely used Greenough-Kittredge-Jenkins Vergil.

GINN AND COMPANY . PUBLISHERS

Boston . New York . Chicago . Dallas . Columbus . San Francisco

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIII, No. 9

MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1929

WHOLE No. 620

THE BATTLE AT MONS GRAUPIUS TACITUS, AGRICOLA 29-37

It is generally assumed that Tacitus drew upon his imagination more or less in his description of the most important battle of Agricola's campaign in Britain; and it is possible to point out details in the description that are clearly based on other battle pictures. For example, the following is read in Agricola 37.2:

...Tum vero patentibus locis grande et atrox spectaculum: sequi, vulnerare, capere, atque eosdem oblati aliis trucidare... Passim arma et corpora et laceri artus et cruenta humus....

In connection with this passage, Dr. Gudeman rightly calls attention to Sallust, *Bellum Iugurthinum* 101.11:

...Tum spectaculum horribile in campis patentibus: sequi, fugere, occidi, capi... postremo omnia, qua visus erat, constrata telis, armis, cadaveribus, et inter ea humus infecta sanguine.

No one, however, seems to have noted that as a whole the description of Agricola's battle parallels in a remarkable degree the story of Pharsalus as written by Caesar, *De Bello Civili* 3.85-97.

At Pharsalus the enemy have the hills at their back; Caesar's forces are far inferior in numbers, and the line is extended to match Pompey's front; yet Caesar draws off a reserve to be stationed in the rear. The enemy execute a flank attack, only to fall unexpectedly upon Caesar's reserves; thrown into confusion, the attacking party scatters to the hills, while Caesar's reserves in good order circle the enemy's flank, thus deciding the issue of the battle.

At Mons Graupius, the enemy are so near the hills that their rear ranks stand on higher ground than the rest of the army; Agricola's line is so inferior in numbers that it has to be drawn out to a length considered by some of the officers to be dangerous. Agricola stations a reserve in the rear; the enemy execute a flank movement, collide with the reserves, and are driven back in confusion. The reserves promptly execute a counter flank movement, and take the enemy in the rear, thus bringing victory to the Roman arms.

It seems very unlikely that such close parallelism is a mere accident. Agricola is spoken of as a diligent student of tactics¹. He may well have taken a leaf out of Caesar's book; and, in his conversations with Tacitus, it would be very natural for him to mention the strategy by which he won his great victory², perhaps even to mention his indebtedness to Caesar³.

If, as is far less likely, Tacitus was left to his own imagination to picture the battle, for his account of

Agricola's culminating victory the story of Pharsalus, where Pompey was eliminated, and the climax of the Civil War was reached, would have formed a most complimentary prototype, so far as the story of that struggle is recorded by Caesar himself.

Two other details are worth noting in this connection. In summing up the loss at Pharsalus, Caesar mentions by name only one officer that fell, namely Crastinus; he charged ahead of the line and met his death in fighting at close quarters with the foe⁴. So Tacitus cites by name Aulus Atticus, whose fiery steed carried him into the ranks of the enemy, where he perished⁵. It is curious and interesting that this is the only place in the Agricola where Tacitus mentions by name any of Agricola's officers.

The other matter might easily be set down as a mere coincidence, namely that Pompey planned to win the battle of Pharsalus by means of his cavalry, which, of course, was made up largely of auxiliary troops. In this way he would save his legions. Caesar quotes him as follows⁶:

...Persuasi equitibus nostris, idque mihi facturos confirmaverunt, ut, cum propius sit accessum, dextrum Caesaris cornu ab latere aperto aggredierentur et circumventa ab tergo acie prius perturbatum exercitum pellerent quam a nobis telum in hostem iaceretur. Ita sine periculo legionum et paene sine vulnere bellum conficiemus....

In like manner Agricola planned to gain the victory by the use of his auxiliaries only, and to save his legions, if possible⁷:

...Legiones pro vallo stetero, ingens victoriae decus *citra Romanum sanguinem* bellandi, et auxilium, si pellerentur <auxiliares>....

If Tacitus, as he wrote, did have in mind the battle of Pharsalus, that fact may have some bearing on a question of text in Agricola 36.2:

...Igitur ut Batavi miscere ictus, ferire umbonibus, *ora foedare*, et stratis qui in aequo adstiterant, erigere in collis aciem coepere....

The manuscripts are unanimous here in reading *ora foedare*, and the editors are practically unanimous in emending to *ora fodere*, a conventional military expression. But Tacitus doubtless was familiar with the story that Caesar's troops were ordered to strike at the faces of their opponents, and that Pompey's young officers rode away to save their good looks. The Caledonians had come out to battle in brave array⁸, and it is not at all impossible that Tacitus should say 'disfigure countenances' (*ora foedare*), with a thought of Caesar's order⁹.

That *ora fodere* is a conventional military expression is no cogent reason for supposing that Tacitus wrote

¹Tacitus, Agricola 5.2.

²Compare the material which Pliny the Younger provided in regard to the death of his uncle at the time of the eruption of Vesuvius. This information was requested by Tacitus for use in writing his *Historiae*. See Pliny, *Epistulae* 6.16, 20.

³On Agricola's modesty in such connections compare Tacitus, Agricola 8.3, 18.7, 22.4.

⁴De Bello Civili 3.99.2.

⁵Tacitus, Agricola 37.6.

⁶De Bello Civili 3.86.3-4.

⁷Tacitus, Agricola 35.2.

⁸Agricola 29.4.

⁹Compare also *verberibus foedatus*, Tacitus, *Historiae* 3.77.4.

it here, for few other Latin authors strive so consciously for variety and the avoidance of the trite and the conventional. Note, in this same passage, how, in § 1, Tacitus begins with the technical *eminus*, and then carefully avoids the trite balance that *comminus* would have afforded, substituting therefor the unusual *ad mucrones et manus*.

These considerations, of course, do not necessarily vindicate the manuscript reading *ora foedare*; but they do suggest the advisability of proceeding slowly in the matter of emendation.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

H. C. NUTTING

TACITUS, ANNALES 4.12.6

Editors have been sorely puzzled by Tacitus, Annales 4.12.6:

...Atque haec callidis criminatoribus, inter quos delegerat Iulium Postumum, per adulterium Mutiliae Priscae inter intimos aviae et consiliis suis peridoneum, quia Prisca in animo Augustae valida, anum suapte natura potentiae anxiam insociabilem nurui efficiebat.

Punctuated thus (I follow W. F. Allen) and taken in its setting, this sentence is entirely clear and needs no emendation, no apology.

Tacitus is sketching the rise and the further ambitious designs of Sejanus. This schemer had already won the heart of Livia (4.3.3). Through her assistance he had compassed the death of Drusus, her husband, and his most dangerous rival. The death of Drusus had caused less regret and less disturbance than Sejanus had anticipated (4.12.1). But, in particular, popular attention had turned to Nero and Drusus, sons of Germanicus, much loved and lamented for his sad death, which had roused so much suspicion (2.69-72). Agrippina, spirited and ambitious widow of Germanicus (1.33.6, 6.25.3), had availed herself of this popular enthusiasm for her family to try to advance the interests of her sons (4.12.2). Sejanus noticed that the death of Drusus had not been taken very seriously, and that it had caused no general regret, and so, emboldened by his crimes and by his successes, he began to contemplate disposing of the sons of Germanicus, who were certain, rather than himself, to succeed to power (4.12.3). He had brought about the death of Drusus by poisoning, but the act had involved much danger and secret plotting (4.3, 4.8.1-2). He could not use poison again, and against three persons. Moreover, the guardians of the children were incorruptible and Agrippina could not be fascinated by his personal charms as Livia had been (4.12.4). Then follows this sentence, immediately before the sentence quoted above:

...Igitur contumaciam eius insectari, vetus Augustae odium, recentem Liviae conscientiam exagitare, ut superbam fecunditate, subnixam popularibus studiis inhiare dominationi apud Caesarem arguerent.

Now the first, and almost only serious problem is this: To what or to whom does *haec* in § 6 refer? Professor Furneaux holds that it refers to Livia. I am confident that this view is correct and that it is beset by no difficulty either from what precedes or from

what follows. The difficulties are supposed to be two. (1) Some see a grammatical difficulty in that, at first thought, it seems that not Livia but Agrippina was last mentioned in the preceding sentence. (2) Some see a difficulty in the fact that not Livia but Sejanus was making use of *callidi criminales*.

I take these in turn.

(1) Agrippina is not the last person named in the preceding sentence. In fact she is not named in that sentence at all, but is introduced in the one before it as the object of Sejanus's immediate attack. This conception of her as the person attacked is carried into the next sentence by such words as *contumacia*, *odium*, *superbam*, *inhiare dominationi*; Agrippina is mentioned in that sentence only by the pronoun *eius*, which comes before the names of Augusta and Livia and is resumed only by the adjective *superbam* and the participle *adnixam*, while both Augusta and Livia are contained in the verb *arguerent*. As Tacitus conceived his sentence, *haec* not only need not suggest Agrippina, it can not naturally suggest Agrippina. Tacitus's thought is something like this: 'Sejanus could not violate the chastity of Agrippina. He therefore resorted to an attack upon her for her wilfulness, and, knowing that Augusta hated her and that Livia was guilty with him of the murder of Drusus <and that she was therefore either wholly or partially, I think wholly, in sympathy with his schemes>, he got them <Augusta and Livia> to criticize her before Tiberius for her pride in her children and her ambition. And the latter <of these two, i.e. Livia, of course at the suggestion and under the direction of Sejanus> engaged clever accusers', etc. This disposes of the grammatical difficulty, which presents itself chiefly because we cannot quite feel or show in English the effect of Tacitus's arrangement, *eius* ... *Augustae* ... *Liviae* ... *superbam* ... *adnixam* ... *arguerent*, which makes Agrippina precede Augusta and Livia, especially as Agrippina had been named in the sentence before this.

(2) The second objection to taking *haec* as referring to Livia does not seem to me serious. Livia acts for Sejanus in what she can do better than he. Livia is now identified with Sejanus—*neque femina amissa pudicitia alia abnuerit* (4.3.3)—and might perfectly well help him to find *callidi criminales*, among whom would be Julius Postumus.

Of course I am taking *haec* as the subject of *efficiebat* and I am 'understanding' nothing, for the sentence runs quite clearly thus:

'And she <Livia> had chosen clever accusers, among whom was Julius Postumus, who was a lover of Mutilia Prisca, and who was intimate with the grandmother, and therefore suitable for her <Livia's> purposes, because Prisca had influence over Augusta, <and in this way> she <Livia> was cultivating in the mother-in-law, who was by nature jealous of power, hostility to the daughter-in-law'.

To be sure, Augusta had all along been hostile enough to Agrippina, but Livia with her aides could intensify the bitterness and so advance the interests of Sejanus, which were now those of Livia also. Finally, it is to be observed that, since this sentence pictures Sejanus

as working, with Livia (*haec*) as his tool, and through men like Postumus, on the mind of Augusta, who already hated Agrippina (*vetus Augustae odium*, 4.12.5), this sentence carries on all the elements in the situation just as they were set forth in the two sentences that precede it.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA,
MISSOULA, MONTANA

W. P. CLARK

VERGIL, AENEID 4.419-420

DIDO'S ANTICIPATION OF AENEAS'S DEPARTURE

Hunc ego si potui tantum sperare dolorem,
et perferre, soror, potero.

The interpretations of the conditional clause in Aeneid 4.419-420 range from causal to contrary to fact.

(1a) The clause is commonly taken to mean, 'Since I have been able', etc.; in this view, *si* = *si quidem*¹.

(1b) But Conington, who translates so, adds,

... Whether she had really looked forward to it we do not know; v. 298 above, to which Henry refers, at least according to its natural interpretation, does not show it; but Dido evidently wishes it to be thought that she had.

Professor Knapp and Messrs. Fairclough and Brown follow this idea, that Dido is dissembling².

(2) Heyne (1821) makes the clause mean, 'Since I ought to have known', etc.³ His note runs thus: *si potui*: quod ad vulgare modum diceret: *si debui*. Quandoquidem dolor hic mihi ab initio expectandus, metuendus, erat (nam praevidere hunc Aeneae discessum poteram ac debebam, quippe qui in Italiam tenderet); itaque pectus puto satis me esse firmaturam ad eum perferendum. Quae praevidere aliquis poterat, tamquam quae, rebus ita ferentibus, euenire poterant, ea, si euenirent, ferenda sunt, tamquam humana, h.e. quae, natura rerum sic constituta, in hominem cadunt.

(3) Servius takes *potui* as equivalent to *potuissem*.

Interpretation 1a is syntactically easy, but the facts are against it. The queen is madly excited (300-303)⁴, expresses astonishment that Aeneas is leaving in mid-winter (309-313), asks Anna whither he is going in such haste (429), and adds significantly (433-434), tempus inane peto, requiem spatiumque furori, dum mea me victam doceat fortuna dolere.

To be sure, she had been the first to notice the signs of departure (296-298). But that was only because she

¹For this view see the notes in the editions of Forbiger, Papillon-Haigh, Allen and Greenough, Bennett, Jahn, and Greenough-Kittredge-Jenkins, and the translations by Lonsdale-Lee, Davidson, Morris, and Williams.

²Such a cursory reference to an editor's views may do him grievous injustice. My whole note runs as follows: "Hunc... potero = 'I shall be as well able to endure... as I was to foresee.' Dido is dissembling in order to deceive Anna, and, through her, Aeneas". I meant, of course, that Dido had not foreseen the *tantus dolor*. Vergil makes that clear enough in the thought that he ascribes to Aeneas himself in 291-295, in his indirect discourse report of Aeneas's conference with Mnestheus, Sergestus, and Serestus:

... sese interea, quando optima Dido
nesciat et tantos rumpi non speret amores,
temptaturum aditus, et quae mollissima fandi
tempora, quis rebus dexter modus. C. K. >

³Compare the editions by Ruæus (1723), Bowen (1860), Frieze-Dennison (1902), and Dryden's translation.

⁴So also the other two chief participants in the events of Book 4, Anna and Aeneas, are in an abnormal state. Such abnormality, added to Anna's rather negative personality, would make it easy to deceive her. That she is completely deceived at the crisis of the events described in the book she tells us herself, in 675-681. C. K. >

would notice most things about her lover sooner than another would, and an anticipation of a few hours only, and hours of frantic excitement at that, would not suffice to make her forewarned, forearmed, and philosophical.

That Dido is even pretending to Anna, as explanation 1b assumes, that she had long foreseen this, is opposed by her opening words (416), *Anna, vides...*, which put the two on the same basis. How can she then immediately 'reassure' Anna by claiming some prior knowledge and mental preparation, and why does Anna at that stage need the reassurance which some editors offer as justifying Dido's supposed dissembling here? What, further, could be less reassuring, if such was Dido's purpose, than the verses (435-436) with which her appeal to Anna closes?

Extremam hanc oro veniam (miserere sororis),
quam mihi cum dederit cumulatam morte remittam.

Again, is there any logic in explanation 2? Would the consciousness that she should have known better some time before be any comfort or support to her now when she sees the outcome of her folly? Perhaps after dreary reflection she might rationalize the situation in this fashion, but the natural, immediate effect would be quite the contrary.

It seems best, therefore, to accept explanation 3, and to take *potui* as equivalent to *potuissem*. In the first place, any simple condition allows two alternatives; in this case the alternatives are 'I was able' and 'I was not able'. Some editors⁵ follow this opening and make Dido's words mean, 'I shall be as well able to bear this as I was to anticipate it—that is, not at all'. Further, there is more latitude than is commonly noticed in the grammatical forms used in contrary to fact conditions. Not only is there the familiar substitution of the indicative for the subjunctive in the pluperfect (Aeneid 4.603; Propertius 2.3.34), but the *perfect* indicative is used in place of the pluperfect subjunctive (Aeneid 4.19, 600, 604; Propertius 1.17.15). The italicized forms below will show how freely Vergil shifted mood and tense (Aeneid 4.18-19, 600-606):

si non pertaesum thalami taedaeque fuisset,
huic uni forsán *potui* succumbere culpae....

Non *potui* abreptum divellere corpus et undis
spargere, non socios, non ipsum absumere ferro
Ascanium patriisque epulandum ponere mensis?
Verum anceps pugnae fuerat fortuna. *Fuisset*:
quem *metui* moritura? Faces in castra *tulissem*
implessemque foros flammis natumque patremque
cum genere *extinxem*, memet super ipsa *dedissem*.

Some one may object that the instances of the perfect are, as it happens, all, in effect, in the apodosis⁶. But in that connection compare Tibullus 1.2.83 non ego, si merui, dubitem procumbere templis; here *num*, which introduces the question (81), shows that the poet does not regard himself as guilty. There is in *dubitem*, of

⁵Dübner, Peerlkamp, Benoist, Lejay.

⁶This is, as note 2 above shows, my view. But I reached that view without doing violence, as, I think, Professor Murley does, to *si potui*. C. K. >

⁷I object, and most strenuously, too. There is a vast difference between *potui* in the conclusion of a contrary to fact condition, and *potui* in the *si*-clause of such a condition. Frankly, I regard Professor Murley's explanation as impossible. C. K. >

course, the common shift from contrary to fact to vague future.

In such substitutions there is seldom, if ever, complete equivalence. There is rather a certain vacillation, which may, in this instance, be somewhat clumsily represented by the following rendering, a fusion of explanations 2 and 3: 'If I had been able to anticipate so great a sorrow (perhaps I ought), I should also be able to bear it (perhaps I must)'.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

CLYDE MURLEY

REVIEWS

Griechische Literaturgeschichte. Erster Band: Von den Anfängen bis auf die Sophistenzeit (Part 1, Text, Part 2, "Anmerkungen"). By Johannes Geffcken. Heidelberg: Carl Winter (1926). Pp. XII + 328; VII + 317.

Besides the revised (sixth) edition of the second part of W. Christ's *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*, prepared by W. Schmid and O. Stählin (Munich, Beck, 1920, 1924) there have appeared in Germany in the last few years several histories of Greek literature, as follows: Wilhelm Nestle, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* (two volumes. Pp. 137, 144. See *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19.65-66); Wolf Aly, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1925. Pp. XVII + 418. See *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 22.110-111), and the volume under review. The last named volume is a far more ambitious undertaking than the other two.

Professor Geffcken needs no introduction to scholarly students of Greek literature¹. His *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, Volume 1, is the outcome of forty years of study. The work is Band IV of the series entitled *Bibliothek der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften*, of which Professor Geffcken himself is the editor. The volume now under review covers the history of Greek literature from the beginnings down to the Sophists. The second volume is to be chiefly devoted to the fourth century, down to Menander. The third, in two parts, will discuss the literature of the Hellenistic and the Roman periods. Each volume is to be accompanied by a separate part containing the bibliography, notes, and such excursuses as the author deems necessary (VII²).

Professor Geffcken thus describes his aim (V)³:

¹<'The ellipses postulated by Professor Murley strike me as violent in the extreme. Such statements as "perhaps I ought" and "perhaps I must" should not be left to inference or to imagination. C. K.>.

²I mention a few of Professor Geffcken's works: *Timaio's Geographie des Westens* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1892); *Das Griechische Drama* (Leipzig, Hoffmann, 1904); *Zwei Griechische Apologeten* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1909); *Kaiser Julianus* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1914); *Die Griechische Tragödie* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914); *Griechische Menschen* (Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer, 1919); *Der Ausgang des Griechisch-Römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg, Winter, 1920).

³Such references as this are to the part of the volume containing the text. References to the part containing the notes will take the form 2.100, note 79, and the like.

<One wonders why "Erster Band" was put together in this stupid way, a way that makes reference to its parts most difficult. It would have been easy to number the pages of the two parts continuously. Publishers here and abroad ought to pay far more attention than they do to this matter of ease of reference. C. K.>.

⁴For assistance in rendering into English the German passages quoted in this review I am indebted to Professor Ernst Riess, of Hunter College.

'... I have attempted... to put in relief the individual as well as to trace the literary movements and the history of ideas through the several periods, to characterize the value of a work for its time as well for all ages, to analyze a literary production as "an entity", and thus to contribute to our knowledge of the Greek genius'.

The author, fully aware of the difficulties of his task, spares no effort to attain his goal. The development of the Greek genius, its continuity and its unity, stand out in bold relief throughout the work. Professor Geffcken fittingly begins with a discussion of the nature of Greece, the character of its people, language, religion, etc. Especially stimulating are his remarks on the religious conceptions of the Greeks (9-11) and their influence upon the unity of literature (13).

The analysis of the *Homeric Poems* (24-49), which is preceded by a brief discussion of Prehomeric and Homeric epic compositions (17-24), is excellent. Stress is laid on the poetic personality of Homer, Homeric psychology, humanity (25-27, 30, 32, 37, 40, 46) and theodicy (28-29). The excursus on the history of the Homeric Question (2.43-66) deserves especial praise. It is a masterpiece of its kind, both in method and in analytical power. Posthomeric epic poetry also receives full consideration (49-57); the influence of Homer is traced down to Nonnus (56). I may remark that the author as a rule traces the influence of the leading poets upon later generations and upon Roman literature. Compare, for instance, the discussions of the influence of Hesiod (63), of Euripides (218-219), of Aristophanes (260-261), and of Thucydides (301).

It is worth while to quote Professor Geffcken's characterization of Hesiod (62):

'A genuine Greek personality stands before us. The imagination of the story-telling poet, his piety, ethical sense, profound seriousness and solicitude without gloom, deep thought without unhealthy hairsplitting, the negation of the phaeacian and idle life of pleasure without asceticism, the genuine Hellenic injunction to observe moderation all unite to give us in their totality the marvellous expression of a truly great poet. With the profoundness of his ethics he leads the chorus of European moralists; in the face of Ionian intellectualism demands religion and discipline; it is introspection alone that he shares with Homer'.

Elegiac, iambic, and lyric poetry are treated, according to their development; special consideration is given to the literary personages within this field of whom definite notions can be formed (2.77). These branches of poetry therefore lack unity of treatment. While Callinus, Tyrtæus, Archilochus, Solon, and Semonides are discussed in Chapter V (69-77), Theognis is dealt with in Chapter X (119-124), and Hipponax in Chapter VII (95-96). Nor does the discussion of lyric poetry (Chapter VI, 78-91), subdivided into (1) music, (2) choral lyric, (3) Lesbian song, form a unity. Simonides is considered in Chapter XI, together with Bacchylides and Pindar (121-141). The reason for this method of treatment is that Simonides belongs to a different period of culture (2.100, note 79). This method is similar to that of Professor Aly, to which I called attention in *THE CLASSICAL*

WEEKLY 22.110-111. Chronological and cultural considerations prompted the author to adopt this method.

The treatment of the branches of poetry mentioned above is, in general, satisfactory. The influence of Homer upon the early elegiac poets is rightly stressed (70). Incidentally I may remark that the close dependence of these early poets upon the language of the Homeric Poems has been investigated by an English scholar, Professor T. Hudson-Williams, in his *Early Greek Elegy* (London, Humphrey Milford, 1926), a book which Professor Geffcken could not include in his Bibliography, since it, too, appeared in 1926. In the bibliography of Solon (76-77), whom the author aptly calls "...mehr ein Stück attischer Reformgeschichte als ein wirkliches Dichtergenie" (76), I find no mention of the most recent edition of Solon by an American scholar, Professor Edwin M. Lintforth, *Solon the Athenian* (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15. 5-6)^{3a}.

On page 88 Professor Geffcken discusses Sappho's relations to her brother Charaxus and the latter's liaison with his Egyptian mistress Doricha. A reference to Athenaeus 13.596 b, a passage in which is preserved a charming epigram of Poseidippus dealing with this liaison, would have been in place in the notes⁴.

The early philosophers⁵ and the philosophical poets are briefly, but deftly, handled in Chapter VII (100-114). The author did not intend to write a sketch of ancient philosophy; his chief aim was to point out the problems which interested the ancient thinkers and the discoveries for which we are indebted to them. In 2.111, note 127, he writes thus:

...Eine reine Doxographie, verbunden mit einer formalen Würdigung ihres Schriftstellertums, genügt mir nicht, wenn ich mich auch der grösseren Aufgabe einer spekulativen Würdigung des von den Griechen Geleisteten nicht gewachsen sah.

Excellent is the ninth chapter, on early historiography (114-119)⁶. In his *History of Greek Literature* (New York, D. Appleton, 1903), Professor Gilbert Murray wrote (113):

And here <in the development of Greek prose> we meet the other tendency which goes to the forming of prose history, the old *Lust zum Fabulieren*, taking the form of interest in individuals and a wish to know their characters and their stories.... We are nearer to fact than in the epics; and the fact behind it is more a human fact...the original speaker is not the Muse but the Ionian traveller....

With this let us compare Professor Geffcken's statement (116):

"The real creative power, however, which, operating from within, led to the rise of Greek historiography, was neither the impulse to become acquainted with foreign countries, nor the desire of telling stories

<"Lust zum fabulieren">, but the old Ionian impulse to go back to origins, to the *ἀρχή* in general. This is a purely intellectual motive which finds characteristic expression very early, in the discussion of the cause of the annual rise of the Nile⁷, a question certainly without any practical purpose⁸.

With Chapter XI the discussion of the Pre-Attic period of Greek literature comes to an end. Chapter XII (143-328) marks the beginning of the treatment of the Attic period. The account of Greek tragedy is very well written (141-219); the plays of the three tragedians are well analyzed. I question, however, the wisdom of discussing in a separate section Sophocles's early plays (166-178), then Euripides's early plays (178-194), and then again the later plays of the two in separate sections (195-203, 204-219). The Rhesus, ascribed by some scholars to Euripides, is not treated by Professor Geffcken; he considers this play a product of the fourth century. It will be discussed in the second volume (2.196, note 1).

Professor Geffcken is not as enthusiastic about Herodotus as are certain other scholars, e.g. Wolf Aly⁹, Joseph Wells⁹, and T. R. Glover¹⁰. Herodotus's good qualities (279, 282) and his bad qualities (275, 278, 280) are impartially scrutinized. Though Professor Geffcken denies that Herodotus's work is a torso, he maintains that it lacks unity and inner form (277-278). Note this statement (278):

...in Herodot bewegen sich die Gegensätze einer ihrer selbst nicht sicheren Kultur und Persönlichkeit.

The author's real hero is Thucydides (289-301); his discussion of this author is one of the finest in the work¹¹. He refuses to believe that the Thracian blood which Thucydides had in his veins was responsible for his lack of Attic grace (290)¹²:

...Nein, der Boden des griechischen Volkstums war reich genug, um Individuen von schroffster Eigenart zu erzeugen....

On page 297 Professor Geffcken writes thus on Thucydides and Machiavelli:

...Sein Wirklichkeitssinn, der überall in der Welt den Sieg der Macht über die Schwäche gewährte, steigerte sich nie zu einem auch noch so leise spürbarem Antimoralismus...jene Erkenntnis bleibt vielmehr eine Erfahrung, der der Historiker...im Dialoge zwischen Athenern und Meliern Worte verleiht.... Es gilt hier das gleiche moralische Urteil wie in der Schilderung der Folgen der Parteikämpfe. Und so scheint auch der Vergleich des Thucydides mit Machiavelli, wie er sich mehreren Forschern immer wieder aufgedrängt hat, nicht unbedingt gerechtfertigt....

^{3a}I take it for granted that "Nilschnelle" is a misprint for "Nilschwelle".

⁸Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und Seinen Zeitgenossen (Göttingen, 1921; see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17.108-111).

⁹Studies in Herodotus (Oxford, 1923; see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.8-9).

¹⁰Herodotus (University of California Press, 1924; see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19.17); this book is not included in the Bibliography.

¹¹English scholarship, which has contributed a good deal toward the elucidation of Thucydides, is represented in the Bibliography by a single work, that of Professor G. B. Grundy, *Thucydides and the History of his Age* (London, 1911; see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 5.94-95). Mr. F. M. Cornford's *Thucydides Myth-historic* (London, 1907), W. R. Lamb's *Chio Enthroned, A Study in Prose-Form in Thucydides* (Cambridge, At the University Press, 1914), and G. F. Abbott's *Thucydides* (London, Routledge, 1925; see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 21.133-134), ought, to say the least, to have been included.

¹²Mr. Abbott repeats this view on page 227.

^{3a}Another discussion of Solon, which appeared after Professor Geffcken's book was published, is entitled *The Work and Life of Solon*, with a Translation of his Poems. This book, written by Miss Kathleen Freeman, was reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 22.189-190. C. K. >

⁴For a discussion of this epigram see Alfred Körte, *Hellenistische Dichtung*, 309 (Leipzig, Kröner, 1925). <See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 23.46, note 1. C. K. >

⁵Except Democritus. See 2.107, note 36.

⁶In the Bibliography I find no mention of Professor J. B. Bury's book, *The Ancient Greek Historians* (New York, Macmillan, 1909).

This passage may be rendered thus:

'...His sense of reality, which observed everywhere in the world the victory of the strong over the weak, never even in the slightest degree becomes an antimoral attitude.... In the dialogue between the Athenians and the Melians...the same moral judgment reveals itself as we see expressed in the account of the results of factional strife. Thus the comparison between Thucydides and Machiavelli, which has suggested itself to several scholars, cannot be unreservedly accepted'.

With these remarks I would compare a passage from Mr. Abbott's work on Thucydides (164-165)¹³:

That Thucydides had a moral heart we see no reason to question, any more than that Machiavelli had a moral heart—though neither wore it on his sleeve. Both accepted the fact that politics are severed from ethics, and, though with very different ends, both studied matters political in the same scientific spirit, uninfluenced by ethical preconceptions. As Machiavelli treats of statescraft as it is, so Thucydides relates the actions of the states as they occurred; leaving the reader to draw the moral, if he pleases.

Discussions of the Sophistic (303-313) and of early oratory (313-321) bring the work to an end. Although Socrates really belongs in this volume, he is reserved for discussion in the second. Of the orators only Antiphon and Andocides fall within the scope of this volume. A fine retrospect is added, which summarizes the achievements of the literary genius of the Greeks (322-328).

On the whole, the book can be considered a fine accomplishment. It is written in a clear and fluent style; it is easier to read than is the history of Greek literature by Christ. It appeals alike to the scholar and to the teacher who is looking for a suggestive and dependable text-book. There is one drawback, however; the writings of English, American, Italian, and French scholars are scarcely represented, although the notes (about 4,000 in number) occupy almost the same space as the text. In this respect Professor Geffcken's work cannot supplant Christ. The Index appended to the volume of notes (293-316) is excellent.

It is to be hoped that the forthcoming volumes will display the same scholarly character as the volume under review.

HUNTER COLLEGE,
NEW YORK CITY

JACOB HAMMER

Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism. By W. Rhys Roberts. Our Debt to Greece and Rome Series. New York: Longmans, Green and Co. (1928). Pp. 150. \$1.75.

There is no scholar to-day writing in English who is better qualified to expound the subject presented in the book entitled Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism than Professor Roberts, Emeritus Professor of Classics in the University of Leeds, England. His two volumes devoted to the rhetorical works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and his editions of Longinus and Demetrius are models of sane and scholarly interpre-

tation. What the student would like to have, therefore, from his pen is a comprehensive history of Greek rhetoric and literary criticism. But the reader who seeks an introduction to this great and interesting field will find the little volume under review of service; within the limits set the task has been admirably done.

Professor Roberts arranges his material in seven chapters, as follows:

I. Plato: Aristophanes (3-19); II. Aristotle, Rhetoric I and II—Contemporary and Earlier Greek Rhetoric (20-47); III. Aristotle, Rhetoric III—Demetrius on Style (48-70); IV. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (71-97); V. Other Critics and Rhetoricians (98-121); VI. Longinus On the Sublime (122-138); VII. Influence (139-150); Notes and Bibliography (153-164).

With respect to the arrangement of the material and the emphasis placed thereon several questions may be asked. The author disregards chronological development and at the very beginning of his book plunges in *medias res*: the earlier rhetoric is discussed after Plato, Aristophanes, and Aristotle. This arrangement is probably calculated to interest the general reader (and is, therefore, a justifiable procedure for a volume in this series), but it is perhaps less clear and not so desirable for the student. Aristotle's Rhetoric, Book 3, is divorced in the discussion from Books 1 and 2 and is placed in a separate chapter, with Demetrius. This is done, of course, because Demetrius treats of *lexis* ('style'), as does Aristotle in Book 3, but Demetrius lived centuries after Aristotle, and, as Professor Roberts makes clear, is non-Aristotelian in his formal types of style and other matters. Chapter V, Other Critics and Rhetoricians, excellent so far as it goes, hardly does justice to the schools and teaching of the later rhetoricians, such as Hermogenes and Menander.

Professor Roberts writes with directness and lucidity. The chapters on Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Longinus are particularly good, as one might expect from the editor of these literary critics. The numerous references in the Notes are carefully chosen and will be valuable to the reader who wishes to go farther in the study of ancient rhetoric. There is, unfortunately, no index.

The brief Bibliography on page 164 needs revision. There are later editions of a number of the books there cited, e.g. of G. Saintsbury, A History of Criticism, of R. C. Jebb, The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus, and of E. Norden, Antike Kunstprosa. To this list, compiled in 1928, there can now be added a valuable reference to Bursian's Jahresbericht (1929), in which there is an article by G. Lehnert, Bericht Ueber die Rhetorische Literatur (1907-1914), 171 titles.

BARNARD COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LARUE VAN HOOK

Pot Shots from Pegasus. By Keith Preston. With an Introduction by Christopher Morley. New York: Covici Friede (1929). Pp. xii + 243. \$2.50.

Some ten years ago Keith Preston was Professor of Classics at Northwestern University and a student of Latin poetry. His Chicago doctoral dissertation,

¹³Compare the remark of Professor Bury (144): "But it was part of the method of both <Thucydides and Machiavelli> alike to eliminate conventional sentiment and morality".

on the *sermo amatorius* in Roman comedy¹, is still referred to not infrequently; and in the files of Classical Philology and The Classical Journal between the years 1914 and 1920 one will find articles of his on Plautus, Terence, Ovid, Martial, and Petronius, *inter alia*, as well as a shrewd note on the use of translations². About 1922 he exchanged his academic career for one in journalism, becoming editor of a daily column, Hit or Miss, and of a Wednesday column, The Periscope, in the Chicago Daily News, later adding to these duties the editorship of the same paper's Wednesday book page. In July, 1927 he died, in his forty-third year.

In Pot Shots from Pegasus we have the work and the by-play of the "professor turned columnist", as the author aptly describes himself (x). Catalepta or Nugae would be an accurate, if less alliterative, title. These little pieces "in lighter vein" date from the last years of the author's life as a journalist; most of them appeared originally in the columns of the Chicago Daily News and the Chicago Tribune. The tone throughout is gay and sprightly, yet mellowed by a literary discernment and feeling that clearly reflect Mr. Preston's earlier training and his innate good taste. This literary flavor, in fact, will redeem for the less frivolous reader many pieces that otherwise would appear altogether trivial.

Part I (1-103) is given over to verse, Part II (105-243) to prose. Besides lively versions of Horace (pages 12, 64, 69, 79, 80, 98, 99), Catullus (99), and Martial (70, 188, 240-242), there are for the reader with classical interests such titles as The Classics in a Nutshell, In Memoriam, Ups and Downs, Phaethon, Actaeon, and Pervigilium Monachi, all redolent of the *jeu d'esprit* that is afforded by a sure knowledge and appreciation of the best classical poetry. The prose of Part II is more ephemeral in its content. Yet here, too, Mr. Preston appears as an evident example of his own observation (237): "One sees many hopeful signs that the gap between the professor and contemporary literature is about to be abridged successfully". In The Proof of a Poet is in his Prose (216) the reader will find a miniature essay on Horace's analytical test of real poetry (Sermones 1.4), while The Most Modern Roman of Them All (222-223) pleads for a wider knowledge and fairer appreciation of Ovid. Martial: A Roman Journalist (238-243) is the last essay in the book and the longest. It wittily upholds the thesis that Martial "was a journalist in the worst as well as the best senses of the word" and that, if he were living to-day, he "would be conducting a polite if racy column of pithy verse and prose". To the reader who knows his Martial it will be quite obvious that Martial and Mr. Preston were in spirit not far apart. The opening sentences of this last essay, though they were written with Martial in mind, are just as applicable to the work of this modern disciple: "Facile and journalistic are two of the most contemptuous epithets

in the entire critical kit. They carry some sting for any writer who employs a light touch to report the passing show, but the effect need not be utterly devastating". Indeed, it need not be.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.

A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. By Edwyn Bevan. London: Methuen and Co. (1927). Pp. xxi+409. 62 Plates. 1 Map.

Mr. Edwyn Bevan's book, A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty, is the fourth volume of the History of Egypt published under the general editorship of Sir Flinders Petrie, and is designed to replace the book of the same name written in 1899, and revised in 1914, by J. P. Mahaffy. The author has made a compromise between writing his own history and re-writing Mahaffy's: there is much deferential quotation from the previous work (indeed, from other works as well, for Mr. Bevan allows himself more freedom in this respect than does the average historian), but there is also much correction. Despite the fact, however, that (Preface, viii) "no one who works in this field can help feeling how much all scholars must owe to-day to the stimulus which a generation ago was given to the study of the Hellenistic age by Mahaffy's vivid intelligence and large discursive erudition", it seems to the reviewer that Mr. Bevan would have done better to write a new history of Ptolemaic Egypt than to pay such continuous reverence to his distinguished predecessor. One may regret that, with the steady accumulation of historical data, the work of pioneers rapidly becomes antiquated; but the fact remains. The brilliant theories of Mahaffy have been absorbed into our general historical consciousness, and extended quotation from his work is now rather flat. Furthermore, to the younger generation who know not Mahaffy the brilliance of his speculation in a field in which he was admittedly one of the first workers will not be apparent when he is so frequently cited merely in order to be contradicted.

The work under review is a chronological narrative of the political history of Egypt under the fourteen Ptolemies, a narrative broken, after the death of Philadelphus, by a very elaborate account (79-189) of the internal organization of the country under that ruler¹. The author calls his book a history of Egypt rather than of the Ptolemaic dynasty, but his description is not accurate. Aside from the elaborate exposition just mentioned, his account is the usual one of the personal vicissitudes of the royal house—with its *farrago* of dynastic marriages, murders and intrigues—rather than the story of the Egyptian people over whom the house ruled. Even the nationalist movement, which, as nearly as anything except the economic interests of the agricultural class, could be called typically Egyptian, is handled from the point of view of the government. The same interest in the dynasty and in the Greeks in Egypt is responsible for the

¹Keith Preston, Studies in the Diction of the *Sermo Amatorius* in Roman Comedy (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Co., 1916. Pp. 67).

²Translators and Translations, in The Classical Journal 15 (1920), 242-244.

¹Subsequent changes in this organization are noted, as they occur in the appropriate chapters.

lengthy, almost disproportionate description of Alexandria (91-104).

There are a few defects which seem to call for comment. One of the devices which Mr. Bevan adopts from the work of his predecessor is the full citation in English of original documents². This is in itself to be commended, although one has the impression at times that the narrative would have been clearer had the author stuck to his tale, given his own opinion simply, and relegated the documents to an appendix. The illustrations are presented with inadequate descriptive comment. To the reader who is not a specialist such comment is helpful and frequently essential (as, for example, in the illustrations of coins). Through the want of such comment the plates in Mr. Bevan's book, although carefully chosen, do not always give the impression of having an obvious relation to the text³. There are no adequate maps. That of the city of Alexandria is useful, of course, but not nearly so much called for as one of the whole of Ptolemaic Egypt⁴. It is true that there is not in existence a really authoritative map of Egypt at this period, but it seems to the reviewer that Mr. Bevan missed a good opportunity to supply one.

If the form of the volume, however, is not everything that one might desire, the critical viewpoint and the poise of the author make up for this defect. Everywhere he displays praiseworthy independence of judgment and a skilful handling of the sources. Only a few examples are needed to show how well Mr. Bevan treats detailed problems.

In describing the Third Syrian War of Euergetes (190-203) Mr. Bevan accepts the theory that Ptolemy

is himself the author of the Gurob Papyrus, and adds the shrewd suggestion (203) that the "sister" mentioned in that document is no less a person than Queen Berenice herself. This suggestion has important bearing also upon the problem of the age of Philopator (217, note). Mr. Bevan's account of the coronation of Antiochus IV at Memphis as merely a caprice "for the fun of the thing" (285) is ingenious and also very reasonable. The modern school of historians which represents the Romans as sentimental and unwilling conquerors of the Hellenistic world will get no support from this author⁵. On the contrary, the ominous advance of the young western power is viewed entirely with the suspicious and intimidated eyes of the East, and the arrogance of the new-comers—even years before they became masters of the Mediterranean—is alluded to at every turn⁶. With this viewpoint the reviewer finds it easy to agree. One of its by-products, so to speak, is an enlightening interpretation, from Cleopatra's point of view, of Caesar on the verge of making himself the successor of the great Hellenistic world-princes (368). The characterization of Cleopatra herself is hard and sharp. The Queen of Kings does not receive the good-natured and indulgent treatment so commonly accorded her by modern historians. On the contrary, she is held up for insistent comparison with her forebears, the great Hellenistic princesses, who displayed "the same precocious masculine purpose, passion for power, ruthlessness in killing" (360).

All in all, this is a book which every student of the Hellenistic world will find a necessary adjunct to his library. It is well printed, on paper which reproduces illustrations adequately, and the proof-reading has been carefully done.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.

²Some of these translations are unusually extended, running from four to six pages in length (e.g. 24-32, 208-214, 263-268). In view of the fulness with which these sources are given, it is perhaps a mere oversight that one of them, the inscription of the elephant-hunters (pictured on page 243), is neither transcribed nor translated.

³Thus, for example, Figure 15 is not mentioned in the text, and Figures 25-27 simply demand some explanation to make clear the points in the text which they are supposed to illustrate.

⁴Two passages in particular—the description of the Fayûm (114-118) and the list of nomes and their officials (139-141)—lack clearness from the want of a good map.

⁵In fact, the Hellenists have been emphasizing this point recently: see for instance Professor Ulrich Kahrstedt's review of W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, in the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1928, No. 10, pages 482-483.

⁶See e.g. the unfavorable twist given to the story of Scipio's visit to Ptolemy VII (310) and the historical setting given to the incredible grossness of the Younger Cato's audience with Ptolemy the Flute-player.